IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA 2 RICHMOND DIVISION 3 4 ROBERT DAVID STEELE, et al. 5 Civil Action 6 v. No. 3:17CV601 7 JASON GOODMAN, et al. July 31, 2019 8 9 10 COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF INITIAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE M. HANNAH LAUCK 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 12 13 **APPEARANCES:** Steven S. Biss, Esquire 14 300 West Main Street 15 Suite 102 Charlottesville, Virginia 22903 16 Counsel for the Plaintiffs 17 Richard Johan Conrod, Jr., Esquire Kaufman & Canoles 18 150 W. Main Street 19 P.O. Box 3037 Norfolk, Virginia 23510 20 Counsel for the Defendant Patricia Negron 21 Jason Goodman, Pro se 252 7th Avenue 22 New York, NY 10001 23 DIANE J. DAFFRON, RPR 24 OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 25

THE CLERK: Case No. 3:17CV601, Robert David Steele, et al. versus Jason Goodman, et al.

The plaintiffs are represented by Steven Biss. Mr. Jason Goodman is *pro se*. And Patricia Negron is represented by Johan Conrod.

Are counsel ready to proceed?

MR. BISS: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. CONROD: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. GOODMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I want to confirm how we're going to proceed. This is an initial pretrial conference, and what we do in this conference is discuss any issues that we need to have prior to scheduling a trial in the case. And so I want to go over a series of things because obviously we've had a lot of motions practice in this court in this case so far, and I want to be sure that everybody understands the ground rules of how we're going to go forward in proceeding with the case?

Now, initially, I want to be clear we are conducting this on the record. So we're in a courtroom. We're in a federal courtroom. We are going to be very formal. Any time you talk, you're going to approach the podium. There are two reasons for that. That is because we do that. That's how we

practice unless we have somebody who needs interpretation because they speak a different language.

You're also going to do that because that way the microphone can transmit what you say readily to my court reporter who can only hear it from the microphone. It is much harder to do that from counsel table. It also assures that people do not talk over each other. So one person talks at a time. Not only is that courteous, it is also literally impossible to transcribe two people talking at once. So we will not do that.

If you have something that you want to interject, the proper thing to do is to just stand where you are, and either I will recognize you or I will not recognize you, but you do not start talking while someone else is at the podium. So that is where we will begin.

Now, the other reason we're doing this is that we have a court reporter here, and that's going to create our official record. I understand that the nature of this case involves communications that are purportedly going over the Internet about what folks have said and what folks have not said. We are only having one record in this case, and it is the record

that Ms. Daffron is creating for us.

Now, part of what we're doing here is we're going to be establishing discovery rules and a trial date. Now, as far as discovery rules, I am well aware that the parties have had difficulty communicating with each other in a productive manner. And so the first thing I want for you all to understand is that the only way that discovery will go forward where anybody records what somebody else has done is through either a deposition with a court reporter or through a trial action.

So what I'm saying is to the extent there has been interaction with each other where clearly emotions have run strong, I want everybody here to tell me whether or not they consent to being recorded by any other party or any other representative of a party during the course of this case. You can stand up and say it, because what that will mean is if that begins, it is automatically inadmissible.

So I'm going to have you speak first, plaintiff. Mr. Biss, you can approach the podium.

MR. BISS: May I approach the podium?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BISS: Judge, just to clarify, when you say recorded by another party, do you mean if I

telephone Mr. Goodman, do I consent to him recording 1 that conversation? 2 3 THE COURT: Correct. MR. BISS: Judge, I do not consent to that. 4 I have two concerns, if I may. 5 THE COURT: If you don't consent to it, you 6 7 don't consent to it. That's all I'm asking. includes for your client; correct? 8 MR. BISS: It's true, Judge. We prefer to 9 10 have it limited solely to a deposition or to in court testimony. 11 12 THE COURT: Which is normally how a court 13 operates. 14 MR. BISS: Yes. THE COURT: All right, Mr. Conrod. 15 16 MR. CONROD: May it please the Court. Johan 17 Conrod for Ms. Negron. We do not consent to recording other than 18 through the deposition or trial process. Thank you. 19 20 THE COURT: So that includes counsel and that includes your client; correct? 21 22 MR. CONROD: It does. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: And it's audio or visual; 23 24 correct?

MR. CONROD: Correct.

25

THE COURT: All right. Have a seat, please.

Mr. Goodman.

MR. GOODMAN: Good day, Your Honor.

I suppose I don't consent to being recorded, but to the extent that recordings exist, I'm a bit confused as to what the implications of what you're asking are.

anything that is already either on the Internet or in the video. That's separate. What I'm saying now is during the course of this litigation, are you objecting to either Mr. Biss, or his client, or an agent, Mr. Conrod, or his client, or an agent recording you either audio or visually at all? Unless it's in a deposition or it's in court like we're recording this right now.

MR. GOODMAN: I apologize for equivocating, but I don't want to relinquish any rights, and since the opposition has objected, I tend to think I should object as well, but I don't say anything that is untrue, and I don't have any fear of anything that I've said being recorded and played back for the Court.

THE COURT: I mean, you can not object. This is really meant to protect everybody.

MR. GOODMAN: If they object, then I will object for the reason that they have, and I will consent to have all future communications go through the official channels that the Court requests.

THE COURT: What I'm trying to do, and just so you understand, I register what you're saying as an objection.

MR. GOODMAN: I object.

THE COURT: There are state laws that allow one party to record another party, and if that one party knows it and even if the other party doesn't know it, it is not illegal. There's no problem with doing it. I really haven't looked at the laws wherever anybody lives, but I think it would create a confusing record if somebody were to do that during the course of this litigation.

So if Mr. Biss or Mr. Steele were to call you and be recording it without telling you, that may be legal. It would be extremely messy, I think, for purposes of this litigation, and I think we have plenty of information about what the other sides are doing or not doing without that.

The same would be true for you. You could not call Mr. Conrod. You're not allowed really to call their clients, necessarily. You should think

about that. But you can't record anybody even if you say "I want to record it. I'm okay with recording it." Some places require both parties to consent.

What I'm saying here is: I am asking whether you all just want to go on the official record that we're creating for this court, which, honestly, I'm not trying to trick anybody. I think it's in absolutely everybody's best interest. It's in yours. It's in Mr. Steele's. It's in Ms. Negron's. It's in everybody's best interest. That's why I'm asking.

MR. GOODMAN: I agree to conduct myself in accordance with your advice.

THE COURT: I'm not giving you legal advice.

I can't give legal advice.

MR. GOODMAN: Sorry. Your preference. I apologize. Really, I would like to apologize for my -- sorry. Let me strike that. I will object and agree to conduct this on the official record if it pleases the Court.

THE COURT: Right. Well, you can do whatever you want to do. I'll lodge it as an objection now. You can do research later on and change it any time you want to. You just have to do it on the record before you change your position. All right?

MR. GOODMAN: Yes. My intention is to

cooperate with the Court.

THE COURT: All right. Okay.

All right. So, Mr. Biss, I directed you in my last ruling to address how you anticipated that we would go forward as far as discovery, because clearly it has not been tremendously successful to date, and I'd like to hear your thoughts on that, please.

MR. BISS: Yes, Your Honor.

Judge, when I received from CM/ECF your order, I sent out an email the same day to all counsel in the case outlining a what I'll call a three-step plan, if you will, for improving the quality of communications in this case in order to address the very issues that Your Honor highlighted.

So, number one, it is the pledge of the plaintiffs and plaintiffs' counsel that they will avoid the vitriol that Your Honor observed in your order, and, quite frankly, in two of the pleadings that I did file, I will -- I will acknowledge that some of the language was unnecessary. It certainly wasn't my intention to cause Mr. Goodman any heartache, but obviously it did.

So our number one point is that plaintiffs and myself pledge that no more language that might be provocative. We're going to stick to legal issues.

We're going to stick to facts in the case. If we have an issue that we think cannot be resolved by the parties through communication, we're going to bring that to Your Honor's attention in the form of a motion with an appropriate memorandum. We're going to do so civilly, and we're going to do so with adequate legal support. That's number one.

Number two, I reversed my decision to eliminate telephone communications with Mr. Goodman, and I pledge to reverse that in its entirety.

There are a couple of areas in the case where the parties need to communicate, and one of those is to resolve any disputes over discovery, and so telephone communications need to occur.

I have again, in light of Your Honor's ruling, and, I think, common sense, I will communicate with Mr. Goodman via telephone. I have concerns about that. I think Your Honor's addressed one of those concerns already with the decision not to have recordings.

One of the things that I was concerned about was that these telephone communications would be livestreamed on the Internet. And I spoke with Mr. Conrod about that, and it just -- it's very unsettling to me. When I speak with somebody and try to resolve

something, I want to have a large sense of trust. I want to say what I need to say to get it done. I don't want to have YouTube videos being made. It's just never -- in 30 years, it's never happened. It's a concern, but I think we really have resolved that.

The telephone communications regarding discovery I think are necessary to resolve disputes, but I will call to the Court's attention, I don't want to get into any telephone communications with Mr. Goodman where he threatens criminal prosecution or he accuses me of crimes and things like that, Judge. This is extremely unproductive and not helpful.

So I will tell the Court in view of the new policy, Mr. Goodman and I did have a conversation -
THE COURT: I'll acknowledge you in a little

bit, Mr. Goodman. Thank you.

production of documents.

MR. BISS: Mr. Goodman and I did have a conversation on Monday, Monday afternoon, after one o'clock. And we went through the ongoing disputes regarding, among other things, the Rule 26(a)(1) documents that haven't been produced, and then the plaintiffs are -- the plaintiffs have some concerns about Mr. Goodman's responses to the request for

We had a conversation about that. We,

unfortunately, weren't able to resolve anything. And so -- but I will continue to communicate via telephone until it becomes futile. At some point it becomes futile.

Number three, Judge, is I continue to be a proponent of email and, to a lesser extent, text message communication. The reason being is that there's no misunderstanding with an email. You can set forth your position, your views, on just about anything. You can do it either in a lengthy email or you can do it succinctly. So I will continue to communicate with Mr. Goodman at his truth@crowdsourcethetruth.org email address only.

Mr. Goodman has indicated that he has another email address. I've been using both, but he's got another email address, ProtonMail, that he doesn't use or he doesn't know the password to. So I'm not going to use that ProtonMail account anymore. And, actually, I stopped doing that maybe a few weeks ago.

So all email communication will go to the one that he acknowledges is active and he uses. And, again, I do think that third form of communication should help the parties avoid emotion. I think it's good because it avoids emotion except when you leave the all caps on, which sort of never really happens,

but email is a somewhat emotionless technology.

And then, Judge, the fourth point that I would raise is if these parties -- if the parties are unable to resolve their differences, courts are perfectly well equipped -- magistrate judges are perfectly well equipped to referee if there's any dispute that can't be resolved.

My experience is there is really virtually no dispute that can't be resolved. And so I think that applies certainly to the discovery context in this case. There are cases, legal cases, that can't be resolved. My experience in the Eastern District is just about every case gets resolved. Very few trials. In fact, I think the last trial I had was with Judge Novak as a magistrate judge.

So that, Judge, is my pledge to the Court in response to your order, my pledge to Mr. Goodman, and of course I will say this: I've had nothing but good luck with Ms. Negron's counsel in terms of communicating, in terms of resolving issues that come up, discussing issues. I have not spoken with Mr. Conrod. My main contact has been with Mr. Wills, Benjamin Wills, but either counsel. It doesn't matter. I copy all three of the counsel on all the emails.

Judge, if the Court has any questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

THE COURT: No, that's fine. I'll hear from Mr. Conrod and then from you, Mr. Goodman.

MR. CONROD: Your Honor, I really don't have very much to add other than, you know, we -- to the extent I don't -- frankly, I don't even think there have been any issues that involved us directly, you know. And that's not to say there won't be. I'm sure we'll object to something eventually. But at this point we haven't been involved in these issues and certainly heed the Court's direction on this and read very carefully your opinion the other day about how to conduct -- how everybody should conduct themselves in this case, and we're going to -- have been trying to do that and are going to continue to try to do that.

And as Mr. Biss pointed out, my colleague
Mr. Wills has been carrying the heaviest burden on
that and does a very good job, but we're doing
everything we can to get this case through to where -a posture that it can be decided and represent our
clients as effectively as -- or our client -- as
effectively as we can, Your Honor.

And so I don't have anything to add other than that. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

So, Mr. Goodman, now you can speak.

MR. GOODMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

I was not going to bring this up today, but to answer a point that Mr. Biss brought up with regard to this ProtonMail address, I have never indicated to him that that was an active email address for me.

That is an address that he extracted from a 2017 communication with a third party, the Elusive Queen Tut, Susan Lutzke. I never indicated that that was an active address.

ProtonMail, just to familiarize the Court, is an encrypted email service. And the issue that I have with it is when you lose the password or forget the password, you are not able to retrieve email from it. The only way to proceed is to create a new password which deletes all emails there to preserve the security of the account.

So at some point in 2017 or '18 I abandoned use of that. I do not use that Proton email account. I have never emailed Mr. Biss from that account. I have never responded to an email from him on that account. I have never seen an email from him on that account.

And, curiously, as I look through all of my

emails with Mr. Biss, he's communicated with me both on truth@crowdsourcethetruth.org, my current email address from my current business, which I am the only employee of. I am the only person who reads that email. I'm the only person who sends from that email. And that is my email address of record with respect to this legal action. And I was very disturbed to learn on May 2nd when I sent Mr. Biss a communication through the normal channels that we have used, primarily because he's refused to speak with me on the phone, that I had said to him "I haven't heard anything from you in a week. So I presume this conference is not confirmed."

The message I had sent to Mr. Biss said, "I will be available after May 1st." The confirmation that he sent into an email hole, to an email address that I don't get, said, "Okay, Jason. We're confirmed for May 3rd."

Now, I don't want to speculate, but in the absence of a response from me, I can't explain why Mr. Biss did not send another email to confirm or call me to confirm. It is my speculation that Mr. Biss intended for me to miss that meeting, and I believe that Mr. Biss has gone out of his way to make it difficult for he and I to resolve disputes before we

came here and utilized the time and resources of this Court.

THE COURT: Okay. So, Mr. Goodman, I'm going to interrupt you for a couple of reasons. One is Mr. Biss said he's not going to use that email address anymore. So it's certainly not an issue going forward.

It is a bad idea to speculate. So I'm just going to tell you that generally. Ultimately, facts, what has happened, is what I determine. So what is very interesting is in a court, you know, say, in a criminal case, somebody comes in and with all their heart they believe that they have not run a red light, and with all heart and good faith on the other side an officer believes they have run a red light. Two people testify. One says, you know what? It was green. The other says, Nope, it was red.

And everybody knows it is illegal to run a red light. And so what gets decided by the judge or the jury is whether it was green or red. It's a fact.

So I will hear the case, determine the facts, and the law. And so usually somebody loses. Like maybe 100 percent of the time somebody loses in court. Right?

MR. GOODMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: So what I am trying to do is have you all adhere to the process, the process, because that's what makes it fair. Due process. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the local rules, the rules of evidence. Those are the rules of the road. They create and they maintain due process. It is extremely important.

But as far as what Mr. Biss intended or what you intended or even sometimes what you said, he could say he said something, and I could find otherwise, and that's a fact of the case. That's why you have an appeal.

You could say you said something, and I could say otherwise. That's a fact of the case. I have to support it. Either the appellate court says I was appropriate, what I did, or they reverse me.

So I really want to focus on how we're going to go forward in a fair and efficient manner because we are not going to have 20 filings for everything that comes in front of the Court. There are rules about that.

And I can tell you there are probably 500 things right now, and I'm really not trying to exaggerate, that the two of you could raise that the other disagrees with about what's happened in the

past. It may be more.

So what we are going to do is assure that I have a record that allows me to make an informed and legally proper decision.

So, first of all, the Proton email, not happening anymore. We are establishing the rules about how you will communicate with each other in a manner that creates a record that I can review and make an informed and impartial decision.

So, I don't have a dog in your fight. And so that's why you're in front of me. That's what I intend to do in the case. But it's clear to me, as you can see based on my previous ruling, my last memorandum and order, that I don't think you guys are even looking at the rules, and that can't happen. If you were looking at them, you need to look at them better because they were completely disregarded. All right?

MR. GOODMAN: Yes. And I appreciate everything you're saying, Your Honor. I would like to reiterate for the record, I sincerely apologize for my failure to adhere to the rules. I assure you that I have looked at them, and I know that you know that I'm pro se and not a lawyer, and this is not an excuse, simply a statement. It's frequently difficult for me

to know what those rules are telling me to do, and I will absolutely make an even greater effort to do that. I do not mean to make your court my crash course in how to be a lawyer.

I think it was important to put these statements into the record. I apologize for speculating. I will leave it to Mr. Biss if it becomes relevant for him to explain why that was the only email --

THE COURT: That's not even at issue today.

We're not even talking about that. All we are doing is figuring out how we're going to talk to each other so you can do on-the-record discovery. We're looking forward. We're going forward.

Now, let me tell you this: As far as being pro se, I have given you tremendous breadth as far as what I've allowed you to file in this court and say and do. Tremendous breadth. The law requires me to read pro se filings liberally, but it doesn't allow you to violate the rules.

And so one of the reasons I'm making this so clear, as I did with Mr. Biss, is this is your warning. I have told you. I took a lot of time telling you what you did wrong so far. Right? I went through the motions. I told you why they were wrong.

I told you about the rules that were potentially violated. That's it.

If you don't understand it, hire a lawyer.

And that's all I can tell you. You don't have a right to counsel in a civil case, so you have to hire a lawyer. And there are plenty of lawyers that might be able to help you, but I don't have any input into that as far as that's concerned because you only have a right to counsel in a criminal case.

So what I want to be sure that you understand, and I'm saying this to Mr. Biss, and I'm saying it to the extent it's necessary to Mr. Conrod, there are sanctions for failing to follow the rules. All right?

So under Rule 11, if you do not follow the rules or the directive of the Court, and this doesn't actually pertain to discovery, and you sign a document, you can pay money to the Court, and you can pay money for fees to the other side. So that's one place where you can get sanctioned.

Rule 26(g) it requires that -- so this is what we're going into, and I'm saying this to all of you, you have to sign the discovery, and when you do, though, when you produce discovery and you sign it, you are saying that you have made a reasonable inquiry

into what you are turning over or saying. It's a reasonable inquiry.

So it can't be the case that you don't really look for things. It can't be the case that you think this is the answer. Now you're in front of a Court, and when you sign a document, it has legal consequences. You have to say, This is really, really all I think I can find. And if later somebody points out otherwise, there can be sanctions. There has to be a substantial justification for having missed stuff. And that's under 26(g)(3).

So, I'm telling you the rules. They are all on the Internet. Most courts have them available on their websites.

MR. GOODMAN: (Indicting.)

THE COURT: Good. That's great.

So if you make an improper certification, either the signer or the party, which basically you would be both because you're *pro se*, can incur reasonable expenses or fees or both.

So regarding interrogatories, you have to sign under Rule 33(b)(3), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(b)(3), and you have to provide documents under Rule 34(2)(B) and (C). So they go in order. Depositions, interrogatories, and production of

documents.

Now, if you don't do it right, and by that that means legally correctly, which you are obligated to learn enough to understand, under Rule 37, either if you fail to disclose what you're required to, under 26(a), which I think you all have had discussions about or 26(e), or if you fail to supplement, and so that means as soon as you know something -- you've found something else or you know something else, you have to tell the other side. Basically, as quickly as you can. And if you don't do that, if you don't supplement or you don't answer, there are pretty serious sanctions for that that don't just go to money.

So it could be the case that you're not allowed to use the information you come up with at trial or at a hearing. Even if it's true, it doesn't go in, because it's not fair. You don't let the other side know. And I make the determination of what the sanctions are.

Most of these have some kind of exception like unless it's substantially justified. Someone would have to say why you couldn't possibly have known earlier or why you forgot to turn it over.

You could also have to pay, and this is all

under Rule 37, pay fees and expenses. It can be the case if it's a jury trial that the jury could be told that you failed to disclose it, and they can infer whatever they want to from that, or I can impose any other sanction, and that includes, and this is under 37(b)(2)(A)(i) through (vi), the sanctions can include that I direct that whatever is improperly turned over or improperly disclosed, that the prevailing party, the other side, those facts, the facts that they want in evidence or that matter, it's just is a fact of the case. That's one sanction.

It can be determined that you've given up your right to challenge it because you didn't do it fairly, essentially.

Under 37(b)(2)(ii), I can prohibit the disobeying party from supporting or opposing any claim or defense, or from seeking to introduce something into evidence.

Under Section (iii), I can strike a whole pleading. I can strike part of a pleading.

And (iv), I can just stay the case until anything is obeyed.

Under (v), I can dismiss the action in whole or in part. On the other side, I can render default judgment, a judgment against the disobeying party.

So it's not just the case that it can cost money. It means that you can win or lose the case if things go too far awry.

And so I'm telling you this, I'm telling Mr.

Biss this, that I have rarely seen so contentious a record before I even have an initial pretrial conference. And I don't care whose fault it is. What I am saying to both of you is it must stop. It must stop.

And, Mr. Goodman, I appreciate that you're saying you're not an attorney and that you're doing the best you can, but even if you're not an attorney and you disobey the rules, with warning, which I'm giving you right now, you suffer sanctions. Do you understand that?

MR. GOODMAN: I do.

THE COURT: All right. Is there something else you wanted to say?

MR. GOODMAN: There is. I'm very aware of the jeopardy that you're describing that I could put myself in, or the case in, and I am committed to following the rules.

I may have to find a lawyer. The reason I do not have a lawyer is I don't have the funds, and I understand that I'm not guaranteed the right for a

lawyer.

There is information that has come to me, because one of the most important things you just said to me, Your Honor, is that we need to have a fair and honest process so that we can have due process. There is a very important matter that has been brought to my attention only days ago that I hope I'll have an opportunity to share with you. I'm happy to share it with all parties. And it speaks directly to the genesis of this matter and the propriety of the whole entire case.

May I share the information with you verbally?

THE COURT: I fear it's going to be totally irrelevant. I'm just going to warn you in advance.

Does either party object here? At least you can answer to it when he raises it.

MR. BISS: I think I know what he's going to be talking about. I object. I don't think it's relevant at all to this case.

MR. GOODMAN: How do you know what I'm going to say?

THE COURT: So, you don't talk to each other like that in the courtroom. Each of you talks to me and you only talk with permission. If it's not

relevant, I can rule on it not being relevant.

MR. BISS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objection on behalf of Ms. Negron?

MR. CONROD: I don't have a position either way, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, let me tell you, Mr. Goodman. I'm saying in advance, my sense is it's probably irrelevant, and to the extent you think it's going to be incendiary, you should really, really be careful because we cannot make accusations against each other party to party, lawyer to lawyer, lawyer to pro se, without a firm basis in this court. All right?

MR. GOODMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. GOODMAN: The information I'd like to share with you pertains to emails a former client of Mr. Biss has sent to me and a narrative that this client, Manuel Chavez, III, who has been discussed throughout the pleadings, the totality of what he has explained to me and the emails that he has shared with me and other documents that he has shared with me indicate that Mr. Biss was in communication with Manuel Chavez during a time period that Mr. Biss's wife, Tanya Cornwell, was in communication with Manuel

Chavez and had paid Manuel Chavez \$1,500 through a service called Patreon and was aggressively trying to convince Manuel Chavez to bring a lawsuit against me concurrent with the lawsuit from the plaintiff.

The plaintiff is also in email communication with Chavez during this time. They discuss how they should not share with anyone various parties that they're communicating with. And Mr. Chavez has provided me with extensive email communications that I believe do provide extremely strong evidence, you might even say prima facie evidence, of the conspiracy that I allege to defame me, to harass me, to destroy my worldwide reputation, and to interfere with my business.

I believe that the intervenor applicant was involved with this as he is also in direct communication with Manuel Chavez during this period, and I have extensive evidence that I intend to share with the Court throughout the course of this trial that I believe will prove that Mr. Biss, his wife, the plaintiff, and various third parties were in a conspiracy to commit barratry. I believe they are in a regular practice of doing this.

A second client of Mr. Biss, who I am not in communication with, made a public Internet broadcast

accusing Mr. Biss, and this is a gentleman named

David Seaman, who I have not spoken to about this

matter. I've spoken to him once in 2016 at a public

event where I met him.

Mr. Seaman, without any input from me, took it on his own accord to produce a broadcast in which Mr. Seaman alleges that the plaintiff, Robert David Steele, aggressively pursued Mr. Seaman to retain Biss for the sum of \$15,000 to bring a lawsuit against an Internet company. I believe it was Twitter. I would have to check. And then Mr. Biss, according to David Seaman, did not show up at the court hearing. He told Mr. Seaman he would have to --

THE COURT: Okay. So, here, I'm going to interrupt you. Okay. What about that is not incendiary? What about what you just said is not incendiary?

MR. GOODMAN: Well, I feel it's relevant because --

THE COURT: No, that's not the question. What about that is not likely to incite another side to anger?

MR. GOODMAN: It's factual.

THE COURT: Even if it were correct, do you think the other side would like it?

MR. GOODMAN: Probably not.

THE COURT: Probably not?

MR. GOODMAN: I don't know.

THE COURT: Would you like it if somebody

said it about you?

MR. GOODMAN: I would never do it.

THE COURT: Listen. You have to answer the questions I am asking you.

MR. GOODMAN: I would not like it.

THE COURT: Of course not. So, here's the issue, Mr. Goodman. Whether or not that did or did not happen, what you just gave me is boatloads, layers of hearsay. Under the rules of evidence, hearsay is inadmissible unless there is an exception. And to bring information to the Court, you have to do it under a rule. You have to make a motion. Under the motion, you have to cite the rule that allows you to bring the motion, and then you write a separate memorandum about the motion, and there you would address relevance. Right? You would say it's relevant because of X, Y, and Z, and I am allowed to tell you this because of X, Y, and Z. And then the other side responds. And they respond however they respond. And then you reply.

If you bring the motion, you get the last

word. You only get three of those, though; right?
One for you, one for the responder, one for you.

But there are rules about how you bring that information to the attention of the Court. And I don't think you can cite a rule to me now because there really isn't one right now for you to put forth all of that information and hearsay to me orally.

So, I can see that you think it matters a lot. What I see in this record is that both, all the parties, especially Mr. Steele, and especially you, really believe the other is in a conspiracy and out to get him. You both believe that. One of you thinks the light is green and one of you thinks the light is red. That's what I see. So I need a basis to make an informed finding about whether or not it's green or red.

So neither of you -- the reason I admonish, including Mr. Biss, strongly, you can't put that kind of junk in a filing in front of a federal court. What you do is you cite facts that you can support, and you cite the law, and you do it under the rules that exist.

I fully and completely understand that the two of you think, meaning Mr. Steele and you, think that the other is out to get you and ruin your

reputation. That is clear. I have hundreds of documents that make that clear to me. So we're beyond that. I know it about Mr. Steele relative to you. I know it about you relative to Mr. Steele.

Now you have to find a legal basis that I can tie it into so that I can make the finding yes or no. If you believe that somebody is defaming, it doesn't matter. I make the finding as to whether or not it's defamatory. And I do it based on admissible evidence that is before the Court and the law.

Now, do you understand why that was not the appropriate time to mention that issue?

MR. GOODMAN: I understand your explanation, and I believe I understand why it was not the appropriate time to mention it.

THE COURT: All right. There's a process.

So what we are doing is we're going to establish a trial date. I'm going to enter an order that sets forth all the pretrial deadlines. My order will set forth when discovery goes forward, when it stops, when motions can be filed, dispositive motions can be filed.

I have a discovery process that I'm not sure it's going to work in this case, so I'm just going to ask you all maybe to handle it a little differently.

And during the process, you all have to do written discovery asking each other questions that are legally viable and written production of documents, and if you think it's unfair or inappropriate, you object under the rules. It has to be under the rules. It can't be that you think it's not fair.

So, I understand that as a pro se person you asked for a protective order basically not to have to do discovery and to stay the case, and I get why you would want to do that, but you just can't. You've been sued. And so I said no to that. So we are moving forward under the rules.

Now, I heard Mr. Biss say he's willing to talk to you on the phone. What I want you all back and forth to do is something that is grown up. You all just have to start talking to each other without such nasty allegations back and forth that the other side loses his mind. And I don't know how else to put it. That's not a legal finding, but that's really how you have to start acting. You're in court.

And so if it cannot happen on the telephone, if tempers flare, email strikes me as the way to go.

I'll tell you, I don't really like text messaging either because it's harder to put into evidence. I can't really say you can't text message each other,

but then if you want to rely on it, you have to put it in evidence, and that's hard to do.

But we just have to get down to the facts of what happened. And we're going to do it, and we're going to do it with a minimum of divergence, because I've allowed you all to have about a year of divergence. And for us, that's a geologic age. We pretty much decide cases quickly.

So are you with me, Mr. Goodman?

MR. GOODMAN: I am, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. So you may have a seat.

All right. Now, I'm going to schedule a trial date in this case, and the deadlines will work back from there. I would not think that this case should go on for three full days, but I'm willing to take three full days to try it.

Do counsel -- Mr. Goodman, I'm sure it's pretty hard for you to figure out how many days this case will take, but does counsel have any input into that?

MR. BISS: If it please the Court, I think three days. We have a significant number of witnesses. We have one expert at this point in time. We have witnesses who are overseas. So there will be

some video depositions probably.

THE COURT: All right. Counsel for Ms.

Negron.

MR. CONROD: Your Honor, I have no idea how long Mr. Biss plans to put it on. If he thinks it will take three full days, then I have no basis to argue with him on that, Your Honor. I don't anticipate our case will be three full days. That's for sure. Maybe a couple of witnesses.

THE COURT: All right. Now, I'm willing to give a little extra time given Mr. Goodman's pro se status. I can schedule the case for March 18, 19, and 20.

MR. BISS: That works for the plaintiffs, Your Honor.

MR. CONROD: That's fine with Ms. Negron, Your Honor.

MR. GOODMAN: It's fine for me.

THE COURT: All right. So the way the jury trial works is that everybody here will come in at nine o'clock ready to go. Any witness, any piece of evidence, you have to be completely ready to go.

Usually before a jury trial we have preliminary things to take care of, and so that means like going over final jury instructions, making sure that we know the

witness order or other issues.

So I don't bring the jury in until ten o'clock, but we will start at nine o'clock. We will bring the jury in at ten o'clock, and we go full days. So we will go all day the 18th and the 19th and the 20th.

It is not the case that -- Mr. Goodman, I'm saying this for your benefit, but it happens with counsel also, as I'm sure these gentlemen have seen. It's no excuse that you thought the case was going to go longer and your client is not there. Either your witness is there on the day you present your case or they're not. So we're going to keep going. So there are no delays on those kinds of bases because we have a jury. Right? We don't waste jurors' time like that. So I want to be sure you understand that.

All right. We also schedule a final pretrial conference. And I'm going to schedule that for February 20. And that will be at one o'clock.

MR. BISS: Judge, I am not available on February 20. I think I'm in trial that day. I can try to move that, Your Honor, because it's a lot of months off.

THE COURT: What about the 21st?

MR. BISS: The only dates in the February I

have are the 24th and the 28th.

THE COURT: Well, I have a jury both days. I don't want to go later than those days. We can move it back, but the issue is that's making your deadlines worse because things fall from the final pretrial conference.

MR. BISS: I'm just not sure what to do.

THE COURT: Well, how about the this: I'll schedule it for the 20th at one o'clock, and you can let me know if there's any possibility of doing anything else at another time. It's only half a day.

So the final pretrial conference, that's in the courtroom. It's very formal. It's very substantive. So that's where the Court decides what is or is not going to go into evidence. So, people say it's not relevant, and I say yes, it is relevant, or I say it's not relevant. If I say it's not relevant, the jury never hears about it. We can't even talk about it. If I say it is relevant, it goes in the trial.

So lots of decisions get made during that conference. It's pretty long, and you have to put together information to submit to me, and usually that is done collectively.

So, I'm going to ask you to sort of look and

read up on that. You'll have to know about the jury instructions. Those are due at a certain date.

Designations of discovery. Those are due at a certain date. Before trial there is a deadline for what are called dispositive motions, motions for summary judgment, and that's an important thing for you to focus on, Mr. Goodman, because it is possible that some or all of either side's case can go away just by written motion. And so you have to pay close attention to what that deadline is. And if you want to try to make somebody else's part of their case go away, you have to follow the rules about how to do that. If you file it late, I can't hear it, because the rules say when it's going to happen.

So my pretrial order is really important.

And so all I can say to you is that you have to read it and absorb it. One of the things it does is that it requires if there is a discovery dispute, that folks fill out a chart about what the discovery dispute is.

Now, I'm struggling to think that you all will be able to do that. It requires moving back and forth for 14 days online saying whether you agree or disagree with each other. With a *pro se*, I'm not sure how effective that can be regardless, because it's

pretty specific, and you're supposed to cite the rules and the basis.

So what I'm going to ask that you all do is that if either side has a discovery issue you want to bring, any side, file a motion with a basis, per the rule, per the law, make it clear, and then contact the Court about how I'm going to handle it.

Once you filed the motion, contact the Court within one business day about seeing what we can do about how to handle any discovery issues. So that will be different in the motions practice itself.

MR. CONROD: Your Honor, can I ask just one logistical question?

THE COURT: Yes. And why don't you approach the podium, please.

MR. CONROD: It's, frankly, kind of a dumb question, Your Honor, but normally the discovery disputes will be handled by the magistrate judge.

When you say "contact the Court," do you mean contact your chambers?

THE COURT: Yes, I don't refer my discovery disputes because I did so many as a magistrate judge. Actually, this chart is usually very effective at resolving them among the parties.

I also believe that I will try the case

better if I know what's going on in discovery anyhow. So I don't refer them.

MR. CONROD: Sure. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Now, I'm going to admonish all parties here, in the Eastern District of Virginia, discovery disputes are extremely rare. And so you really are required, pro se or not, but counsel also, you are required to make a really good faith effort to resolve the dispute, and any resistance one way or the other, Mr. Goodman, has to be based on the rules, not whether you think it's fair. It has to be based on the rules. And so it will be presented to me in that fashion.

And because of the kind of motions practice

I've had to date, I'm going to tell you, I'm going to

be swift to issue sanctions, because I'm warning you

now, because I think it's over the top what has been

in front of the Court already, and we're just going to

move forward. We're going to try this case.

If you have a defense, and the other side thinks that they have a case, we'll just try it.

That's what we're here to do, but we're not here to get stuck in the weeds of either inconsequential or irrelevant issues.

My last thing, I told you that I would take

under advisement the motion for a protective order.

And two parties have agreed to the protective order.

I want to ask you first, Mr. Biss, there is a series

of paragraphs in the protective order that refer to

"for counsel's eyes only," and I want to ask you to

explain to me and to Mr. Goodman how that works in the

context of one of the parties being pro se.

MR. BISS: Yes, Your Honor. What I tried to build into the protective order was for purposes of that particular designation, the pro se litigant would be considered counsel. So if there were, for instance, a sensitive financial document that we did not want Mr. Goodman sharing with a third party, we would indicate that for counsel's eyes only, meaning for Mr. Goodman in his capacity as a pro se litigant, for his eyes only.

THE COURT: All right. And where is that built in?

MR. BISS: Judge, I didn't bring the protective order with me, but I believe it's in the section that talks about for counsel's eyes only. If it's not, that would be what I would envision putting in that section.

THE COURT: All right. It does say in paragraph 2(g) on page five that for purposes of this

paragraph only, paragraph only, any pro se party shall be deemed to be counsel. I presume that you mean paragraph -- I think you have to be a little more clear about that.

MR. BISS: For purposes of that, that's a subparagraph.

THE COURT: Just can say, you know, it's paragraph 2 -- it's all in paragraph 2, right?

Because you have 2(d)(i) through (iv). Then you have (e), (f), (g). So please write it like a layperson could understand it.

MR. BISS: All right.

THE COURT: All right. Let me tell you this, Mr. Goodman. I've said in my past order that this protective order, Ms. Negron has agreed to be bound by it. This protective order, except for this one issue, I want to be clear that when it talks about "counsel's eyes," it means also you as pro se, and I think Mr. Biss did try to put it in. Because it's in the middle of a paragraph, and it says "this paragraph," and it's paragraph 2(g), I think it can be cleaned up a little bit. But I think you're hearing now that that designation "for counsel's eyes only" means that only the lawyers can see it and only you can see it, and they can't turn it over even to their own client.

Is that what you mean by that, Mr. Biss?

MR. BISS: Yes, Your Honor. He is his own

client, so that's --

THE COURT: Right. But I'm saying it couldn't go to Mr. Steele or Ms. Negron if it's marked that.

MR. BISS: That's correct.

THE COURT: All right. So, I don't see this as particularly troublesome, but I am not your lawyer. So you cannot rely on anything I say one way or the other. I'm saying it to all of you. I'm expressing or asking a question with respect to Mr. Biss about how it's worded. But this is meant to protect the papers for everybody.

If you mark it that it's confidential or it's for counsel's eyes only, then this order says you can only do certain things with it. It cannot be marked for counsel's eyes only or for confidentiality by anybody irresponsibly. It's not the case that everything is confidential.

But the parties generally agree to this. And I don't know why, it doesn't matter why, there's been no input from you as to this protective order. And so what I'm going to order as your first test is that in seven days I want a written filing in this court as to

whether or not the protective order, as filed, whatever version it is, is agreed to or not agreed to.

If it is not agreed to, I want the party that is not agreeing to explain why in writing. Seven days.

Do you understand that, Mr. Goodman?

MR. GOODMAN: May I --

THE COURT: It's yes or no.

MR. GOODMAN: Well, I can answer it now without filing.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GOODMAN: If Mr. Biss will agree to modify the language such that anything marked confidential can be seen by me as my own client, then I'm fine with it, and we can agree to that now. I will accept it now.

I also want to add that I have never live-streamed a phone call with anyone without telling them, and I have substantially all of the requested discovery material that doesn't include photographs of myself naked. I've got all the emails with both co-defendants, the plaintiff, and the counsel for the plaintiff ready to deliver to the Court, copies to both sides, and I just want to clarify that the only issue with the discovery was the noncommunication.

And if we can communicate, I'm happy to provide discovery materials that are reasonable, not based on hearsay, and I believe the Court will agree that me naked has nothing to do with this case. That's certainly irrelevant.

THE COURT: I'm not going to make any ruling on any discovery matter that I don't have both sides on and understand what question it pertains to, what request for production it pertains to. There is a process to raise those issues. And so I'm just not answering that.

As far as the protective order, I think that Mr. Biss just said that if it's marked confidential or for counsel's eyes only, that you can see it as your counsel and as being the client. I believe he answered that question in the affirmative.

Is that correct, Mr. Biss?

MR. BISS: That's correct, Your Honor.

MR. GOODMAN: I understood it was pertaining just to the paragraph that you were talking about, so perhaps that was a misunderstanding on my part.

THE COURT: I do think, Mr. Biss, you should be clear about exactly what it covers. So just work with Mr. Conrod to make the language crystal clear for a human being that hasn't been spoiled by having a

legal education. All right?

MR. BISS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, I'm going to give you seven days, and you have to submit the statement with the protective order on that date.

I believe that you all can do that. You can submit the protective order. If it is jointly submitted, I will enter it. If it is not jointly submitted, you have to submit the order that is disagreed upon, and the party that doesn't like something about it has to tell me why in writing, succinctly, no more than three pages, because the protective order itself is 10 pages.

So we can't go into much. Just say I don't like it for this reason. I think it's not appropriate under this rule or this law or this case. But I actually think you can submit it. It is meant to assure that all parties are bound to handle discovery in a fair way. It goes without saying there's no live-streaming of any conversation.

And as with you, you shouldn't insinuate, and Mr. Biss, although he said he was fearful it would go live-stream, I just can't take that into account. You guys are not going to do that. I'm not weighing that against you any more than I'm weighing against Mr.

```
1
    Biss what you suggest may have happened with
    scheduling because of the email that it was sent to.
 2
 3
    All right? Blank slate for everybody.
             Is there anything else I need to address?
 4
    Mr. Goodman?
 5
             MR. GOODMAN: I'm fearful that anything I say
 6
 7
    is going to be inappropriate at this time, so I won't
    say it.
8
9
             THE COURT: Okay. We're only here to
10
    schedule the trial date, so that's probably true.
             All right. Mr. Biss?
11
12
             MR. BISS: Nothing from our side, Your Honor.
13
             THE COURT: All right. Mr. Conrod?
             MR. CONROD: Nothing further, Your Honor.
14
             THE COURT: All right. Well, I look forward
15
16
    to having your filings. And I really do encourage you
17
    all to -- you just have to put a little bit of steam,
    water on the fire. Just try the case that I am able
18
    to try. And it's way more limited than what I've been
19
20
    getting filings about. All right?
             So that's all we have for today. I'll enter
21
    an order accordingly. Thank you.
22
             (The proceedings were adjourned at 3:54 p.m.)
23
24
```

I, Diane J. Daffron, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

/s/

DIANE J. DAFFRON, RPR, CCR DATE

2 0